

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
Christophe Maleville	4717-6600	4834
	EXAM	INER
	JACKSON, ANDRE K	
	,	
	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	2856	
		Christophe Maleville 4717-6600 EXAM JACKSON, ART UNIT

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			AL
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/664,782	MALEVILLE, CHRI	STOPHE
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	André K. Jackson	2856	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence add	ress
Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	l. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the stafutory minimum of third d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONute, cause the application to become AE	reply be timely filed by (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this contained and the contained are contained.	nmunication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	ance except for formal matt	ers, prosecution as to the	merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D). 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims	·		
4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the applicatio	n.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	awn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,16 and 20</u> is/are rejected.	•		
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>3-15,17-19 and 21</u> is/are objected to	o.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.		
Application Papers	·		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac	ccepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyar	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ction is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFF	R 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTC	D-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 		3 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
2. Certified copies of the priority documer		oplication No.	
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the pri		· ·	Stage
application from the International Burea	au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	st of the certified copies not	received.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date		nformal Patent Application (PTO-	152)

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1,2,16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindahl et al. in view of Brown.

Regarding claim 1, Lindahl et al. disclose in the patent entitled "Determining cleanness of air in a controlled environment" exposing a test surface of a test substrate to the atmosphere for a test time to capture an amount of particles and analyzing the amount of captured particles (Column1, lines 70-72; Column 2, lines 3-19). Lindahl does not disclose comparing the analyzed amount of particles with a reference amount of particles from a reference substrate to determine the particle concentration in the environment. However, Brown discloses in the patent entitled "Method and apparatus for investigating surfaces" comparing the analyzed amount of particles with a reference amount of particles from a reference substrate to determine the particle concentration in the

environment (Abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lindahl to include comparing the analyzed amount of particles with a reference amount of particles from a reference substrate to determine the particle concentration in the environment. By adding this feature the user would be able to determine the amount of particles collected on a substrate being tested.

Regarding claim 2, both Lindahl and Brown disclose that it is known to clean at least the test surface of the test substrate prior to exposing it to the atmosphere (Column 1, lines 64-65 and Column 1, line 15).

Regarding claim 16, both Lindahl and Brown disclose that it is known to clean at least the substrate prior to exposing it to the atmosphere to provide an essentially particle-free reference (Column 1, lines 64-65 and Column 1, line 15).

3. Regarding claim 20, Lindahl do not disclose analyzing a particle concentration of the reference substrate. However, Brown discloses analyzing a particle concentration of the reference substrate (Column 1, lines 45-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lindahl to include analyzing a particle concentration of the reference substrate. By adding this feature the user would be able to precisely measure the particles on the test substrate.

4. Claims 3-15,17-19 and 21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to André K. Jackson whose telephone number is (571) 272-2196. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. 7AM-4PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hezron Williams can be reached on (571) 272-2208. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A.J. ()

Page 5

February 3, 2005

HEZRON WILLIAMS

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800